

6/10/70

Dear Bud,

Thanks for the copies of the papers filed in court in our action. Glad to have a complete set. I've done an article on it for the National Enquirer, which will make it conform to their style before publication, date not yet set. I'll let you know when I know. As of now, because they are paying me for it (slight as their rate is) I'm looking for no publicity on it and, in fact, inclined to shun it. Once out, it does provide a forum for other things.

Should not there have been a copyright notice or patent mark on your "motion For Case to be Set at Head of Docket"? My contact with the law and its forms is slight, but this is a motion of which I'd never heard before! Which makes it even better!

I've sent you my letter to Rolapp. No response yet. Mitchel did reject appeals on panel raw materials, spectro only. I'll bring copy in. You know his unusual letterhead. Well, he also has spotted envelopes to match!

I have gone through the FOI Center report. Several of these cases look like they may be relevant. I list them below in the event it presents no special problem to you to get copies.

Under Appeals Court, the 3 and 8 items: Skolnick v. Parsons 397 F 2d 759 (1968); and Amer. Mail Line Ltd v Gulick, 411 F 2d 696 (1969)

Under District: (2), Shell Oil and Shale v. Udall, CA67C321, rule 9/18/67, appeal 9/25/67; Benson v GSA 289 Supp 590 (1968); (12) Matonie v FDA, CA No 479 -68, prelim motion injunction denied 4/8/68, gov't motion granted 5/8/68 DC for DC; (19) Epstein v Stanley Resor 296 F Supp 214 (1969); (20) Consumers' Union v VA, order 7/10/69.

Under Pending: (13) Rayner & Stonington, Inc. v US FDA CA No. 68-1995, order 8/14/69.

There are several items I'd like to go into with you in detail when it is possible. Until then, may I urge these things upon you: get copies of all of Huie's letters to Ray (I have far from all and only some relating to money), and any of Hanes' and Foreman's. Ask him to write out in detail his account of "Raoul"'s flight and dropping of the stuff, his position and that of the car, and since you do not know why, you cannot tell Ray if he asks. It is important, I am certain. I want to avoid any possibility of feedback, which I am certain you also do. I already have something here and he may make more important to him quite possible. He may not know the significance of what he can say and at all costs I do not want him to have any idea why I want this, for I was whatever he says as untained as it can be (and not for publication, for your use ONLY and in court at the right time. Get from him as detailed as possible a description of the second man, the one with Raoul, when he went to Mexico. And you should be able, despite the court's recent ruling, to get all records of all prints found in the flophouse, on the various items, including especially what might be overlooked, the car and the butts and other items like these in the car.

Let me know when we can get together and I'll come in.

Sincerely,

I'd like the copy of the new pleadings whenever possible. I'd like to be able to go over them to know what you used and how and of the new ones of which I had no advance knowledge. From the brief item in the S-1. I think your defeat was a success.